



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE GENESIS OF "AMERICANISM."

BY J. ST. CLAIR ETHERIDGE.

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for March contained an article from the pen of Mgr. Péchenard, the rector of the Catholic University of Paris, on "The End of Americanism in France." Those who have read with interest this *oraison funèbre* will desire to hear the story of the genesis of Americanism; for, as Mgr. Péchenard remarks, "Americanism has had a history." Such a supplement to an article on the passing of the newest heresy is needful; for, even at this late date, the people of America know little or nothing about a movement which is regarded as one of the most deplorable incidents in the history of the Catholic Church in recent times. The literature of Americanism is almost entirely in a foreign language, and Americanism itself was unheard of in the United States until the moment when the news of its condemnation was cabled from Rome.

To the term "Americanism" two widely different meanings have been attached—one political, the other religious. Political Americanism was first brought into prominence forty years ago by Father Hecker, the founder of the Paulist Congregation. It maintains that Catholics accept with the fullest frankness and loyalty the Constitution of the United States as suited in every way to the Church in America, and also that the principles which the Church stands for are of vital importance to the great Republic of the West. Father Hecker realized that the Church in America presented, at least to the superficial glance, a foreign aspect. "It is not natural with us," he wrote before his conversion; "hence, it does not meet our wants, nor does it fully understand and sympathize with the experiences and dispositions of our people."*

* "Life of Father Hecker," by the Rev. Walter Elliot, page 137.

However, upon a closer acquaintance with the Catholic religion, he discovered the wonderful harmony which exists between the principles that underlie the Constitution of the United States and those which are bound up with the charter of the Church. And when, after many struggles and wanderings, he became a Catholic and entered the priesthood, mindful of his own difficulties, he lost no opportunity of showing his countrymen that America is the congenial home of the Church, and that the Church is the most efficient ally of democracy. Political Americanism, then, simply means that every good Catholic in America should also be a good citizen, that every loyal member of the Church should also be a loyal member of the Commonwealth. It promotes every movement that aims at uplifting the masses politically and socially, and seeks to leaven with the principles of Christianity all the relations of life, public and private. Without abating a jot or tittle of Catholic doctrine, it strives to break down the barriers of bigotry, and to unite Catholics with their non-Catholic fellow citizens in every cause that makes for the welfare of the people. Without sacrificing an essential of Catholic organization, it adapts the external methods of the Church to the needs of the times, and of a people gathered from every land under the sun and chanting the creeds of a hundred denominations. Americanism, in this sense of the term, far from being condemned by Leo XIII., was approved and blessed by him. It is only the embodiment of the principles laid down in his memorable letter to the French people, exhorting the Catholics of France to identify themselves with the nation.

Religious Americanism is that body of crude heretical opinions lately condemned at Rome and contained—so Mgr. Péchenard and his school allege—in the same biography of Father Hecker in which political Americanism is also set forth. Father Hecker and they who sanctioned his principles and methods, it is charged, would minimize Catholic doctrine in order to gain adherents to the Church. They would exalt natural qualities of character, but at the expense of supernatural virtues. They would give to the individual a liberty of thought and action incompatible with the scope of ecclesiastical authority. They would advocate the absolute separation of Church and State in all countries and in all circumstances. They would even lay down false principles of piety, and regard as out of date the great religious orders, depre-

ciating the moral value of the vows which hold these vast spiritual organizations together. From the "Life of Father Hecker," by the Rev. W. Elliot, or rather from a French adaptation of that work, M. l'Abbé Charles Maignen extracted the opinions which we have rehearsed and labelled them "Americanism." By what process these errors were obtained from the biography of Father Hecker; by what right they received the name of Americanism; for what motives they were foisted upon Catholics of America, and by what men all this was done, we now proceed to set forth.

M. l'Abbé G. Peries, formerly a Professor in the Catholic University of Washington, is the Coryphæus of Americanism. Four years ago, M. Peries was removed from the University for causes which do not here concern us. The following letter addressed by him to Bishop Hortsman, who laid it before the Board of Trustees of the University on the occasion of the dismissal of the Professor, explains itself and throws light upon the origin of Americanism:

"I do not want any scandal, but I must warn you that if something is made against me, the country at large, and the Roman competent congregation will know what has been the spirit of this house, and I will do that, not in view of the mean revenge, but for the interests of the Church.

"I hope, nevertheless, that nothing such will be necessary, and that I will not be obliged for the honor of my name, and the defense of my interests, to enter a struggle which would prove disadvantageous for several, and for the great aim we have in view in this institution.

"G. Peries.

"Please do not lose my documents. I can want them again."

This letter, as it stands, is an extract from the Minutes of the Twentieth Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Catholic University of America, April 18, 1896.*

On his return to France, M. Peries straightway began his work of reprisal. In the threatening letter which he had addressed to Bishop Hortsman, he had declared his intention of making an exposure—the interests of the Church demanded it—unless he were retained in his position at the University; and so, for more than two years, he conducted a campaign of calumny against the Church in America, and indeed against America itself, with all its institutions, social and political. He was meantime joined by the fanatic of the movement, M. l'Abbé Maignen, who, in a book entitled "*Le Père Hecker—Est il un Sainte?*" formulated the errors at present known under the name of Amer-

* *The New Era*, June 17, 1899.

icanism, and ascribed them to Father Hecker and other Americans.

M. Maignen's views of America, characteristic of the school to which he belongs, will be new to the readers of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW; indeed, the possibility of such views being held by any man in his senses will be a revelation to people who speak the English language. He assures us that America, as a nation, "is not even in swaddling clothes, it has yet to be born." "Hostile races are meeting and clashing within the walls of the American continent, like Esau and Jacob in their mother's womb; * * * nobody knows or can know what will come out of the chaos" (p. 171). Americans are little better than Bedouins: "You live in the midst of upturn populations of immigrants, who wander over the vast American continent without finding a place of rest" (p. 214). His heart goes out to an anonymous friend who writes: "You cannot understand how we suffer at finding ourselves so far from *la belle France* among this greedy people" (p. 284). The two latter passages have been omitted by M. Maignen in the English translation of his book. They, doubtless, belong to the class of sentences to which Mgr. Satolli referred in his letter to the author: "I believe the English version has done well in softening that vivacity not easily separable from the French language. I notice, moreover, that certain passages have been modified for the better."

M. Maignen does not approve of the Parliament of Religions. He is shocked at the iniquity of those Catholics who took part in proceedings which were opened by a recital of the *Pater Noster* according to the Protestant formula. In that formula, "which" is used instead of "who" in the opening words of the prayer, and M. Maignen gravely informs his readers that "'which' is a pronoun applied to animals and things, not persons" (p. 220). This learned note is also omitted in the English version of the book.

It would be interesting to reproduce in full M. Maignen's views on things American—on the race war which is about to break forth in the United States, "violent and irresistible," and on the golden staircase built by George Gould; and on another staircase, each step of which is to cost 14,000 francs, and on President McKinley as an incendiary. All these details would be valuable from the psychological point of view, and would prepare us for M. Maignen's methods of controversy; but we must regretfully pass them over.

M. Maignen, as a critic and theologian, is an adept in all the devices of the heresy hunter. He puts upon the rack the thoughts of the simple priest whom he is pursuing, and strives to extort from them by hook or crook matter for the condemnation of the Inquisition. He subjects to the solvent of syllogisms the meditations of a truly sacerdotal heart; and, with the help of scholastic distinction and subdistinction, he proves that such views are not to be found in Mgr. Satolli's abstruse metaphysical treatises, nor in the tomes of mediæval theology in the midst of which his life is passed. He wrenches passages from their context and bases upon them charges that are refuted in the very chapters from which the sentences are torn. He attributes to American prelates every vagary of liberalism which appears in obscure European journals, and, with unsurpassed insolence and impudence, he calls upon them to disavow articles which they have never heard of. He places in violent juxtaposition with a discourse of Archbishop Keane, as orthodox as the canons of the Council of Trent, a heretical article in the *Contemporary Review*, and, with an audacity that is truly ludicrous, makes one of the most pious prelates of the American Church speak the language of Welhausen and Harnack! Worst of all, M. Maignen has been repeatedly convicted of downright dishonesty. He accuses Father Hecker—a priest known to all as a man of exalted piety—of lacking in the fundamental devotion of the Catholic religion, and when from pages of surpassing beauty a score of thrilling tributes to the Incarnate Word are quoted to him as words of the man whom he assails, he is reduced to savage but impotent silence. Again, in order to establish Father Hecker's lack of reverence to the Crucified, he counts the number of times the name of Jesus occurs in his biography, and triumphantly asserts that "the Adorable Name is not pronounced perhaps five times in this volume of almost five hundred pages." A critic, suppressing his disgust for such senile logic, points out that the Sacred Name is found in the book not five but thirty times*—more frequently than in many standard works of Catholic devotion. To this instance of dishonesty we must add a case of falsification so flagrant as to throw serious discredit on M. Maignen's entire work. One of the "proofs" which he brings to show Father Hecker's lack of piety is as follows: "The only reproach recorded in

* *La Vie Catholique*, Oct. 27, 1899.

Father Hecker's life is one which he addressed to a young priest who wanted more time for prayer, and him he advised to go and 'suck his thumbs' out of America" (p. 142). Turning now to the biography of Father Hecker (p. 407), we find this account of the incident referred to:

"The following anecdote of his missionary days shows Fr. Hecker's contempt for lazy devotion. Once when upon a mission a young priest, just returned from Rome where he had made his studies, expressed his desire to go back to Italy as soon as possible, saying, 'I find no time here to pray.' Father Hecker felt indignant, for it did not seem to him that the young man was very much occupied. 'Don't be such a baby,' said he. 'Look around and see how much there is to be done here. Is it not better to make some return to God—here in your own country—for what He has done for you, rather than to be sucking your thumbs abroad? What kind of piety do you call that?' "

And yet this book, the classic of Americanism, is dedicated by its author to Jesus and Mary, and even attributed to them as their work. Never in the annals of controversy has such a book borne such a dedication. It is now plain why the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris refused his imprimatur to this volume, and why the work finally saw the light only when, in contravention of the rules of the Index,* a Roman firm was added to the French publishers and Father Lepidi, a Dominican monk, gave permission to print it.

To the question, Are the opinions which have been condemned under the name of Americanism contained in the biography of Father Hecker? it must be said that whoever reads the book not in the spirit of the partisan theologian, but in the simple good faith of the man who wrote it, will find in it nothing even remotely opposed to Catholic teaching. With the methods, however, which M. Maignen employs, the most orthodox Catholic work may be made to yield every heresy from Gnosticism to Jansenism. *The New York Freeman's Journal* (March 4, 1899) draws attention to the fact that the fundamental error attributed to Father Hecker, obedience to a subjective guide rather than to the Church, would astonish no one more than Father Hecker himself. "A reference to Father Hecker's original writings," says the *Freeman's Journal*, "shows that he taught the very opposite of the error attributed to him. * * * We knew Father Hecker well, and we know that to him the voice of the Church was the

* *The Times*, Sept. 15, 1899.

voice of God." And what is true of this error is true of every other erroneous opinion alleged to have been found in the book. For instance, M. Maignen asserts that Father Hecker intended to introduce a new theory of spiritual direction, while, in the very biography from which he argues, the author explicitly states on this point: "It need hardly be said that Father Hecker did not claim to have any new doctrine; there can be none, and he knew it."* Again, M. Maignen charges Father Hecker with scorning the passive virtues, but in the same breath he is forced to confess that Father Hecker's "best inspirations and his finest pages are those from which radiates, with a singular intensity, the mild but powerful glow of the passive virtues."† Similarly, the liberty of individual action, in which the French theologian can see only a subversion of authority, *The Month*, the English Jesuit magazine, takes as evidence of a remarkable breadth of thought.‡ No unbiased reader can fail to see that what Father Hecker understood by individual action is simply that bold and self-reliant personal initiative which, in the military life, marks the American soldier and makes of him a thinking bayonet.

It has been said that the translation of Father Hecker's biography upon which M. Maignen brought his syllogisms to bear is responsible for some of the errors referred to; but we are inclined to agree with l'Abbé Naudet, a distinguished French priest, who writes (in "*Justice Sociale*") : "If Americanism is a body of doctrine, we confess having found it in the books of Abbé Maignen, and in diverse articles published in '*La Vérité*,' but we have not seen it elsewhere—not even in the French adaptation of the 'Life of Father Hecker.'"

Another book which forms a picturesque contribution to the campaign of Americanism, and illustrates the fanaticism that runs through the entire movement, is "*L'Americanisme et la Conjuración Antichrétienne, par M. l'Abbé Henri Delassus*." M. Delassus, scorning the petty calumnies of M. Maignen, sets himself to demonstrate that Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Ireland and other American prelates are in collusion with Jews and Freemasons to hasten the triumph of Antichrist and the overthrow of the Church. The book is brilliant with such gems of knowledge as that Disraeli was Prime Minister of England for forty

* "Life of Father Hecker," p. 302.

† "*Le Père Hecker*," p. 103.

‡ *The Month*, July, 1888.

years, and that England spends vast sums annually in fostering disloyalty and discontent in France. It is beneath notice.

A more important factor in the movement we are considering is the "*Civiltà Cattolica*," the principal organ of the Jesuits. This Italian journal has done immense harm to the best interests of religion by the narrowness and intolerance of its views. Its bigotry, political and theological, its truculent methods of controversy, and its impatience of liberty and progress in every form are contributing much to alienate the intellectual element of Europe from the Church. It was the "*Civiltà Cattolica*" which, more than any other European journal, rendered possible the greatest hoax of the nineteenth century. It may be necessary to remind American readers that, a few years ago, Leo Taxil, a pretended convert to Catholicity, made revelations of Freemasonry which were so absurd that only the most rabid credulity and fanaticism could swallow them. A mythical young lady named Diana Vaughan was the medium of the exposure. Having been initiated into the secrets of the Masonic sects at an early age, and having had several interviews with the devil himself at Charleston, South Carolina, she was eminently qualified to unveil the mysteries of an organization which was devoted to the worship of his Satanic Majesty. During three years, in a series of articles which showed the hand of the keen theologian, the "*Civiltà Cattolica*" popularized the revelations of Leo Taxil, and proclaimed as implicit a faith in Diana Vaughan as those good men of the Delassus type who were making mementoes daily for her in their masses. Even after Diana had announced that she had been married to the devil and had found him young and handsome, the "*Civiltà Cattolica*" never wavered in its gullibility; Diana Vaughan's revelations were "precious publications which were unequalled for exactness and usefulness." From this it may easily be gleaned what part the Jesuit journal was prepared to play in Americanism. Men who believed that at Charleston the devil regularly appeared, horns and tail and all, and that the beautiful Southern city was "the sovereign centre of Satan worship," could easily convince themselves that America itself was the seat of any or every grotesque heresy.

The "*Civiltà Cattolica*" has always been the enemy of democracy and of democratic institutions, and hence of America and of all the principles which America represents. Only a few

years ago, in an article entitled "*La Scuola dei Equivoci*," and aimed at America, it proved with enthymemes of matchless cogency that the very idea of a democracy is a contradiction in terms; and in the latest issue which lies before us, it ridicules the loyalty of American Catholics to the Stars and Stripes.

The fanaticism and Americophobia which we have seen at work in France and Italy were also active in Canada. In the hands of M. Jules P. Tardivel, "*La Vérité*" of Quebec vied with "*La Vérité*" of Paris in bigotry and bitterness. To M. Tardivel belongs the unique distinction of having demonstrated that Diana Vaughan was a creature of flesh and blood. At a time when every wag in Europe knew that Diana Vaughan had no existence outside the imagination of Leo Taxil, and when every man of judgment was wondering at the gullibility and fanaticism of so many Catholics, M. Tardivel assumed the rôle of detective and swooped down upon the Hôtel Mirabeau, Rue de la Paix, Paris. To obviate any possibility of deception, he took with him a friend and an official of the Civil Court of Paris. An investigation of the registry led to the discovery that Diana Vaughan had sojourned for a whole week at the hostelry, and had eaten and drunk like other people. M. Tardivel had a *procès verbal* drawn up at once, which, when duly signed and sealed, should convince the world that Diana Vaughan was not a simple myth. During the three years which have elapsed since his visit to the Hôtel Mirabeau, M. Tardivel has changed but little. Americanism is his new Diana Vaughan. The title of his book, which has appeared quite recently, and which contains his contributions to the literature of Americanism, is "*La Situation Religieuse aux États Unis*."

M. Tardivel's chief qualification for his rôle of controversialist is, like that of his allies, hatred of America. The American Government, he tells us, is built upon an unsound principle (p. 129); it is the eldest daughter of Freemasonry (p. 130), and its people are atheistic in spite of the President's proclamation establishing Thanksgiving Day (p. 131). Blasphemy and other violations of God's commandments are protected by our laws (p. 133). Even the English language, "which, somewhat modernized, *i. e.*, corrupted, is generally spoken in America, is the vehicle of materialism, for it is in English that there arises from all this vast territory the blasphemous concert in honor of the golden calf, the idol of the American people" (pp. 217 and

218). The public schools engender crime and nurture ignorance (p. 71); indeed, "the public school is an engine of hell" (p. 162). Nowhere are there so many fervent adepts of the world cursed by Christ as in the United States of North America (p. 141).

The entire book is a foul and contemptible calumny on America. As one reads it, one is forced to ask, Why is it that all the men who "discovered" Americanism, and then clamored for its condemnation, are, without exception, slanderers of America?

The man who has most recently made his voice heard in the one-sided controversy on Americanism is Mgr. Péchenard. He comes to bear witness to "the happy frame of mind" in which his countrymen have been put by the passing of Americanism. As might be expected, in one holding his position, his sympathies lie with the titled *réfractaires*, who cannot but be pleased with the orthodoxy of his article in this REVIEW. But certain it is that now, more than ever before, the friends of the University of Paris will mourn the loss of Mgr. d'Hulst, the predecessor of the present rector, who would never have suffered that great seat of learning to become the ally of men who attempted to blacken the fair name of the American Church.

To this list may be added the names of three others more familiar to the public—Cardinal Mazzella, Cardinal Satolli and the Rev. David Fleming.

Cardinal Mazzella, a Neapolitan Jesuit, has, since his elevation to the Sacred College, devoted his life to advancing the interests of his Order. He is the mouthpiece of the "*Civiltà Cattolica*" and the executive of its policy.

Cardinal Satolli is well known in America as the first Apostolic Delegate to the United States. It was during his sojourn at Washington that, in some unaccountable way, he meddled in the affairs of the Catholic University, throwing the weight of his influence against the American members of the faculty, and in favor of the foreign element which was then led by Professors Schroeder and Peries. He eventually obtained from the Pope the letter demanding the resignation of Bishop Keane. Since his return to Rome, he has maintained an attitude of sullen hostility to America and everything American.

Father Fleming is a Franciscan monk, and he was the friend and co-laborer of Dr. St. George Mivart. He was formerly highly respected at Rome as an exemplar of large-mindedness. Recently,

however, in obedience to the edict of his Order, he has become the exponent of English reactionary views, and he is rapidly atoning by his zeal in his new cause for his theological escapades of former years.

These three men engineered the condemnation of Americanism at Rome. They made M. Maignen's theses their own and led the Roman Curia to take cognizance of them.

Such are the principal factors in the genesis of Americanism—the men who labored to fasten the charge of heresy upon American Catholics. They are typical representatives of a composite school of thought which is a standing menace to the peace of the Church. They execrate America with a blind fierceness that would be incredible to us did we not have ocular evidence of it, and their hatred of America is only an expression of their hatred of democracy. They are the ecclesiastical allies of all the political *réactionnaires* of the Old World, who would fain blot out from the continent of Europe every vestige of democracy—the theological scribes of all who chivalrously and foolishly cling to lost causes and *régimes* of olden days. So unreasoning is their detestation of republican institutions that M. Maignen, the leading spirit among them, openly resisted the Pope's call to the Catholics of France to rally to the Republic. M. Maignen's conduct was on that occasion so insubordinate that Mgr. Ferrata, the Papal representative at Paris, closed the doors of the embassy against him. Thus is it that these Grand Inquisitors of the American Church hate democracy more than they love the Pope. They hunted down Father Hecker because he was guilty of the unpardonable sin of believing that the future belongs to democracy, and that democracy will understand and cherish the Catholic Church. Therefore it is that Father Hecker, and they who think with him, must at all costs be branded as heretics, for a charge of heresy is always the shortest and easiest way of disposing of a man.

The result of the agitation inaugurated by these men was to put before the world a body of doctrines which were utterly at variance with elementary Catholic principles, and which, if actualized, would be pernicious to the Catholic religion. Such was the furore caused by Americanism in France and Italy that, in the interests of the faith, the Sovereign Pontiff was obliged to take cognizance of the opinions labelled with that name, and to

condemn them wherever they might be found. This he did in the famous document addressed to Cardinal Gibbons.

This letter, hailed by the enemies of America as a triumph, is in reality the only bright page in the history of Americanism. As we read it we feel that we have passed from the atmosphere of sordid strife, where men with motives live and squabble, into the august presence of one of the greatest Pontiffs of the Church. Every line of the document breathes respect for the Church in America, and of that Church no member, be he bishop, priest or layman, is censured or condemned. "Certain opinions concerning the methods of Christian life," "which are sometimes included under the name Americanism," and "which have been brought in" (by some persons not named), are false and dangerous and to be repudiated—such is the sum and substance of Leo's decision. The Pope not only carefully guards himself against imputing to American Catholics the errors sometimes included under the name Americanism, but even signifies his incredulity that such errors are held by Americans. "If, indeed, by that word (Americanism) is meant qualities of mind which distinguish the people of America as other nations are distinguished, and in so far as the expression applies to the constitution of your States and laws, there is not, assuredly, the smallest reason for us to think it should be rejected. But if it is used not only to describe but also to justify the errors we have already pointed out, what doubt can there be that our venerable brethren, the Bishops of America, will be the first to reject and condemn it as injurious to themselves and the whole nation?"

And promptly came from the American Hierarchy the disavowals for which the Pope looked. The press announced from day to day that five archbishops and their suffragan bishops, representing some of the greatest Sees of America, while condemning what the Pope condemned, respectfully defended the American Church against the imputation of heresy. Americanism, they wrote, as synonymous with false doctrine, was unknown in the land. These prelates are Cardinal Gibbons, of Baltimore; Archbishop Williams, of Boston; Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul; Archbishop Riordan, of San Francisco, and Archbishop Kain, of St. Louis. To these may be added Archbishop Ryan, of Philadelphia, and his bishops, who informed his Holiness that scarcely any among the souls committed to their care held the false prin-

ciples so justly condemned. From Chicago and Dubuque came no reply, the archbishops of these provinces being then ill. The archdiocese of Santa Fé was vacant. The Archbishops of Portland, Cincinnati and New Orleans did very little more than acknowledge with reverence the receipt of the Pontiff's letter. Out of the fourteen archdioceses of America two only—those of Milwaukee and New York—reported the presence of Americanism. This had been expected. The letter from the ecclesiastical province of Milwaukee represented the views of four German bishops; and, although the friends of these prelates defend their action on the ground that not one of the good pious men had ever read the "Life of Father Hecker," it should by no means be overlooked that Milwaukee is the pet preserve of Cahenslyism—it is a Fatherland itself against the influx of American ideas. As to miniature American Germany, more carefully barred than the New York, it is said with much show of reason that had there not been of old serious friction between that See and those of Baltimore and St. Paul, Archbishop Corrigan might not have so suddenly detected the smell of heresy. This is rendered probable by the fact that the "Life of Father Hecker," from which the heresy was supposed to have been extracted, actually bore the imprimatur of Archbishop Corrigan himself. Be this as it may, it is, now more than an open secret that the letter which his Grace of New York sent to Rome in the name of his suffragans did not represent the views of some at least of the bishops whose signatures it bore.

And here we must call attention to a glaring instance of the bad faith of the enemies of America. The "*Civiltà Cattolica*" and all the journals that take their cue from the Jesuit organ published the two letters which alone reported the existence of heresy in the American Church, as also the letters which courteously acknowledged the receipt of the Roman letter; but they sedulously excluded from their pages the letters of the archbishops who protested that the condemned doctrines were unknown in America. The "*Civiltà Cattolica*," which alone seems to have had access to the replies sent by the American Hierarchy, has not given to the public the letters on Americanism forwarded to Rome from five of the chief centres of the Catholic religion in the United States. It has never alluded even to the reply of Cardinal Gibbons, to whom the Papal document had been addressed. And

while it suppresses the testimony of bishops whose names would carry weight in every part of the world, and whose evidence would at once clear the American Church of the suspicion of heresy, while it ignores the chorus of repudiation of the Catholic press of America—a protest so spontaneous and universal that the bishops of Milwaukee raised against the Catholic journalists of the country the cry of Jansenism—it continues, together with its satellites, to cry out from Rome and other European centres that the errors condemned by the Pope actually found a home in America.

Mgr. Péchenard also still holds that American Catholics are guilty, first, of “a certain bending in the matter of dogmatic affirmation;” secondly, of “a separatist tendency with respect to the central ecclesiastical authority,” and third, of “a minimizing in the practices of the Christian and especially the religious life.”

These are grave accusations; but it will be observed that he does not offer a particle of evidence in support of any of them. He does not name a single book or discourse which could form the basis of the charge that American Catholics are guilty of tampering with the doctrines of the Church. He does not mention a solitary instance which would indicate a “separatist tendency” in the Church in America. It is one of Mgr. Péchenard’s fellow countrymen—M. Brunetière, a man whose testimony is unquestioned in two continents—who recently wrote of the American Church: “No other Church adheres with more absolute fidelity to Rome or pays more strict attention to all her observances.” The American Episcopate, it is observed, has always avoided extremes; its members have not had to do penance for Gallicanism, nor have they been laughed at for having made an act of faith in Diana Vaughan.

As to the third accusation which Mgr. Péchenard makes, the indictment would be intelligible if only some example had been given of the alleged “minimizing in the practices of Christian life.” If Mgr. Péchenard means that there are wanting in America certain devotions which the *Propagateur de Saint Joseph* has been for years offering to a certain class of French minds—devotions which are exposing the Church in France to ridicule—then there is room for this criticism; but if he means that American Catholics detract in any way from the sound Catholic devotions, approved by the Church, then his accusation is in every

respect like the rest. The piety of American Catholics is as far above suspicion as their orthodoxy; although neither their piety nor their orthodoxy dispenses them from protesting before the world against insults put upon their Church.

Mgr. Péchenard assures us that Americanism is dead in France. Indeed, the publication of the Pope's letter was an event of much greater importance for France than for America. The Archbishop of Paris made it the subject of a pastoral which, however, was disfigured by the lamentable assertion that certain Catholics in America substituted the natural for the supernatural virtues. Similarly, the Bishops of Nancy, Annecy and Beauvais used the utmost diligence in circulating the Pontifical letter among their clergy. It is a relief to know that these bishops have succeeded in strangling Americanism in their dioceses. In the United States, except in New York and Milwaukee, the Papal document was received with an unbroken calm which has excited much surprise in Europe. Indeed, the nonchalance with which the condemnation of Americanism was received in America has been the source of some disappointment and misunderstanding among the heresy hunters of Europe. Thus Mgr. Péchenard draws attention to the fact that Archbishop Ireland, during his sojourn last year in France, nowhere discussed Americanism, and intimates that the prelate's silence was an avowal of guilt. It is said, however, that the dignitary whom Mgr. Péchenard attacks is a practical man, and that he has but little admiration for the mythological heroes of the Valhalla who pass their days in hewing down shadows. Those who have read the well-founded statement that at Rome Mgr. Ireland was congratulated by the Sovereign Pontiff and leading Cardinals for having correctly interpreted the Pope's letter, will find a more obvious reason for the disdainful silence of the Archbishop of St. Paul.

In Europe, Americanism was cradled as well as entombed; in America, it was unknown until it was condemned. In Europe, for some time to come, the dead heresy will doubtless be taken as seriously as Gallicanism and Jansenism; in America, it has already become only a memory, except for the curious few who take an interest in myths of the Diana Vaughan type.

J. ST. CLAIR ETHERIDGE.